

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed May 10, 2002. Applicants have amended claims 18, 38, 39 and 45, and added new claims 51-74. Claims 1-74 are now pending in the application. A version of the amended claims showing changes pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.121(c)(ii) is attached. In the attached version of the amended claims, Applicant has used underlines to indicate inserted matter and strikeouts to indicate deleted matter.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-50 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,058,417 to Hess et al. (Hess) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,735 to Holub and the web site maintained by retailer Eddie Bauer at www.eddiebauer.com (Eddie Bauer).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Hess et al., Holub and Eddie Bauer fail to disclose or suggest the inventions set forth in claims 1-50. Moreover, the applied references provide no teaching that would have suggested the desirability of modification or combination to arrive at the claimed inventions.

Unlike the method defined by claims 1-15 and computer-readable medium of claims 16-35, for example, the applied references provide no teaching that would have suggested receiving color images from source clients via a computer network, communicating the color images to destination clients via the computer network, and modifying the color images based on the colorimetric responses of display devices associated with the source clients.

Also, contrary to the requirements of claims 37-50, the applied references fail to disclose or suggest a system having a network server that receives color images from source clients and communicates the color images to destination clients, and a color image server that modifies the color images based on the colorimetric responses of display devices associated with the source clients.

Claims 1, 16 and 36

In support of the rejection of independent claims 1, 16 and 36, the Examiner characterized Hess as disclosing a method and apparatus for information presentation and

management in an online trading environment. In particular, the Examiner stated that Hess describes:

an online trading environment where person-to-person commerce over the Internet is facilitated by providing prospective buyers the ability to quickly preview items for sale. Images are harvested from a plurality of sites based upon user-supplied information. The user-supplied information includes descriptions of items for sale and locations from which images that are to be associated with the items can be retrieved.

Accordingly, the Examiner cited Hess for the teaching of an online person-to-person trading system in which images of traded items can be displayed. The Examiner recognized, however, that Hess provides no teaching that would have suggested modifying the color images based on the colorimetric responses of display devices associated with the source clients, i.e., the entities that provide the images.

In an attempt to fill the acknowledged gap in the Hess teachings, the Examiner cited Holub. In particular, the Examiner characterized Holub as disclosing a system for controlling reproduction of input color image data between nodes in a network. The Examiner stated that Holub describes generation of calibration data that characterizes output colors produced by rendering devices associated with the nodes, and use of the calibration data to produce information for transforming input color image data to output color image data.

On this basis, the Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious to modify the Hess system, in view of Holub, to modify color images received from source clients based on the colorimetric responses of display devices associated with the source clients. The Examiner reasoned that such a modification would have been desirable "to present the images for remote users as close as possible to the original and minimize customer complaints."

The Examiner's conclusion of obviousness is improper. The Examiner failed to cite any teaching that would have suggested modification of the Hess system to include the features taught by Holub. In particular, the Examiner pointed to no motivation in Hess, Holub or any other prior art reference that would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to undertake the necessary modifications. Instead, the Examiner clearly relied upon Applicants' own disclosure for the requisite motivation. Therefore, the Examiner did not establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

It is well established that the Examiner bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. In re Oetiker, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In doing so, the Examiner must determine whether the prior art provides a "teaching or suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the changes that would produce" the claimed invention. In re Chu, 36 USPQ2d 1089, 1094 (Fed. Cir. 1995). A prima facie case of obviousness is established only when this burden is met.

It is improper to point to teachings of motivation contained within Applicants' own disclosure. In re Oetiker, 24 USPQ2d at 1445. Moreover, it is insufficient to merely pull such motivation out of thin air. Rather, the Examiner's rejection must be based on substantial evidence in the record demonstrated that the motivation for making the claimed invention resides in the prior art. In re Lee, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1433 (Fed. Cir. 2002); In re Chu, 36 USPQ2d at 1094.

The Federal Circuit has emphasized that the finding of requisite motivation in the prior art is not a trivial requirement, but rather the best defense against a hindsight-based analysis. In re Lee, 61 USPQ2d at 1433. This finding must be based upon substantial evidence, and not subjective musings or conjecture by the Examiner. Id. at 1434. Deficiencies in the evidentiary record cannot be cured by general conclusions such as "general knowledge" or "common sense." Id. Accordingly, the Examiner cannot rely on unsupported, conclusory statements to close holes in the evidentiary record. Id.

The conclusion of obviousness advanced by the Examiner relies on a motivation plucked directly from Applicants' own disclosure, rather than the prior art. Indeed, the Examiner cited no prior art teaching as the source for the motivation. Moreover, the Examiner failed to explain why one of ordinary skill in the art would have considered it desirable "to present the images for remote users as close as possible to the original and minimize customer complaints" in the Hess system.

Hess makes no mention whatsoever of the desirability of color image accuracy in the disclosed online trading environment, nor any concerns about minimizing customer complaints relating to color image accuracy. Accordingly, without access to Applicants' own disclosure, it is difficult to understand why one of ordinary skill in the art would have embarked on an effort to

address concerns that were not discussed in the Hess reference nor any other prior art reference identified by the Examiner.

Holub describes color accuracy in a networked environment generally, but does not contemplate an environment, like that of Hess, in which color images are exchanged between source clients and destination clients, e.g., for online trading services. Absent some mention of online trading environments or image quality issues associated with such environments, it is unclear why one of ordinary skill in the art would have consulted Holub for modification of the Hess system.

Even if Holub were consulted, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found no motivation to undertake modification of Hess to arrive at the claimed invention. Like Hess, Holub does not discuss image quality issues associated with the exchange of color images between source clients and destination clients, and certainly makes no mention of the desirability of minimizing "customer complaints," which was part of the motivation posited by the Examiner. Therefore, Holub provides no teaching that would have been sufficient for modification of the Hess system to arrive at the inventions defined by claims 1, 16 and 36.

Of particular note, with respect to the system of claim 36, the Hess and Holub references also lack any suggestion of a network server that receives color images from source clients and communicates the color images to destination clients, and a color image server that modifies the color images based on the colorimetric responses of display devices associated with the source clients. Indeed, the Examiner failed to identify any structure in Hess or Holub that corresponds to a color image server. Consequently, the Examiner clearly did not establish a prima facie case of unpatentability with respect to claim 36.

In summary, the Examiner's conclusion of obviousness, and particularly the cited motivation to modify Hess, is unsupported by any substantial evidence in the record. Therefore, the rejection of independent claims 1, 16 and 36 is improper and must be withdrawn. Dependent claims 2-15, 17-35 and 37-50 likewise are allowable over the prior art of record. Set forth below, however, are comments highlighting some selected features recited in the dependent claims and similarly lacking from the applied references.

Claims 2-4, 17-19 and 37-39

It is unclear why the Examiner grouped claims 2-4, 17-19 and 37-39 together, inasmuch as the claims recite entirely different aspects of the claimed invention. Apparently, with respect to claims 2, 17 and 37, the Examiner acknowledged that Hess fails to disclose modification of images based on the colorimetric responses of display devices associated with destination clients, as set forth in claims 2, 17, and 37, but asserted that Holub teaches the use of a color measuring instrument (CMI) for measuring the color output of a rendering device. The teachings of a color measuring instrument by Holub do not suggest modification of color images communicated from source clients to destination clients in the Hess environment. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found no motivation within Holub to modify Hess to arrive at Applicants' claimed invention. Moreover, this aspect of Holub does nothing to address the basic deficiencies already discussed above with respect to claims 1, 16 and 36.

The Examiner further made reference to a listing server, thumb server and thumb building machine described by Hess, apparently with respect to claims 3, 4, 18, 19, 38 and 39. However, none of those features would have suggested modification of color images at a network server that includes a web server, as set forth in claims 3, 18, and 38. Likewise, the features identified by the Examiner would not have suggested modification of the color images at a network server before communication of the color images to the destination clients, as set forth in claims 4, 19 and 39. Indeed, the Examiner failed to explain how such features would correlated with the requirements of the claims, and did not even set forth a conclusion of obviousness. Accordingly, the relationship between the features taught by Hess and the requirements of claims 3, 4, 18, 19, 38 and 39 is unclear to Applicants.

Claims 7-9, 22, 23, 25-27 and 42-45

With respect to 7-9, 22, 23, 25-27 and 42-45, the Examiner acknowledged that neither Hess et al. nor Holub discloses characterizing the colorimetric responses of the display devices by delivering a series of web pages to the client that guide the clients through a color profiling process. Applicants note that claims 22, 26, 27 and 42 do not require delivery of a series or web pages. Nevertheless, the Examiner cited Eddie Bauer as disclosing the delivery of a series of web pages to guide a client through a color profiling process. In particular, the Examiner noted

that Eddie Bauer “allows customers to select from the available color on the display to view the product in that color, and, displays the product on the customer’s display in the selected color.” On this basis, the Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious to modify the Hess system, as modified by Holub, to deliver a series of web pages to guide clients through a color profiling process. The Examiner reasoned, without pointing to any prior art teaching, that such a modification would have been desirable “to generate additional revenue by expanding their user base by offering their system to other businesses (for example online apparel companies).”

There are a number of basic problems with the Examiner’s conclusion of obviousness. First, the Examiner provided no date for the Eddie Bauer reference, making it difficult to determine whether Eddie Bauer actually constitutes prior art relative to the claimed invention. Specifically, it is unclear whether Eddie Bauer is available as prior art given Applicants’ filing date of March 15, 2001. Applicants request that the Examiner substantiate this position by attributing a publication or public use date to Eddie Bauer.

Second, the Examiner’s interpretation of the scope and content of the Eddie Bauer reference is misguided. Eddie Bauer does not disclose or suggest characterization of the colorimetric responses of display devices by guiding clients through a color profiling process. Rather, the Eddie Bauer features identified by the Examiner pertain to viewing an article of clothing in different colors. For example, a visitor to the Eddie Bauer site may view a particular shirt in a variety of different colors by selecting a color button and receiving a new image depicting a shirt in the selected color. Any relationship between the color selection feature of Eddie Bauer and characterization of the colorimetric response of a display device, as claimed, completely escapes Applicants. The selection of a color for viewing an article of clothing simply bears no relevance to a color profiling process that characterizes the colorimetric response of a display device. Therefore, it is unclear why the Examiner cited Eddie Bauer.

Third, even if Eddie Bauer were somehow relevant, the Examiner’s analysis lacks citation of a prior art teaching that would have suggested the requisite motivation to include the features set forth in claims 7-9, 22, 23, 25-27 and 42-45. Assuming the desire to “generate additional revenue by expanding . . . user base” was expressed in a prior art reference, it is difficult to understand how such a vague objective would have guided one of ordinary skill in the art to consider the very specific requirements of Applicants’ claims. In other words, Applicants are left

to wonder what causal relationship could possibly exist between a desire to make more money and a motivation to modify the Hess system to include color profiling features as claimed. In summary, the rejection of claims 7-9, 22, 23, 25-27 and 42-45 in view of Eddie Bauer is misplaced, and should be withdrawn.

Claims 11-13, 29, 30, 32, 33, 47 and 48

With respect to claims 11-13, 29, 30, 32, 33, 47 and 48, the Examiner noted that Hess describes the posting of user-supplied information including descriptions of items for sale, and designation of different URLs for images associated with the items. The Examiner acknowledged that neither Hess nor Holub discuss the calculation of a fee for a modified image, but pointed to a number of web space providers (Pongo, Twaze, PixHost) that charge users fees for "photo hosting." It is unclear whether the Examiner was actually applying the Pongo, Twaze and PixHost art as references in support of the rejection.

Nevertheless, charging a fee for photo hosting in general does not amount to a teaching that would have guided one of ordinary skill in the art to charge a fee for *modification* of an image, as set forth in the claims, particularly in the Hess environment. The Examiner's observation that someone could "increase revenue by charging fees for additional services" is universal and offers no special insight with respect to the particular fees contemplated by Applicants' claims. Moreover, the Examiner's cryptic reference to the ability to "minimize dependency on outside content providers and make their system more reliable" seems to have no connection to the Hess system.

Finally, the Examiner seemingly overlooked the specific requirements of other claims, e.g., such as permitting source clients to specify whether the color images are to be modified, and charging the fee to the source clients in the event modification of the color images is specified, as set forth in claim 12, or permitting destination clients to specify whether the color images are to be modified, and charging the fee only in the event modification of the color images is specified, as set forth in claim 13. Accordingly, the Examiner's analysis falls far short of establishing a *prima facie* case of unpatentability.

Claims 14, 15, 31, 34, 49 and 50

Much of the analysis above with respect to claims 11-13, 29, 30, 32, 33, 47 and 48 applies in the case of claims 14, 15, 31, 34, 49 and 50. For example, the fact that photo hosting services may charge fees to users does not amount to a teaching that would have suggested charging a fee for modified images to one or both of the source and destination clients involved in an auction sale. Again, a vague desire to "increase revenue" does not live up to the requisite motivation, particularly where there is no such teaching in the art of charging the fee for modification of an image in the first place.

All claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 50-1778. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application if deemed helpful in advancing prosecution.

Date:

9-10-02

SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.
8425 Seasons Parkway, Suite 105
St. Paul, Minnesota 55125
Telephone: 651.735.1100
Facsimile: 651.735.1102

By:



Name: Steven J. Shumaker
Reg. No.: 36,275

VERSION SHOWING CHANGES PURSUANT TO 37 CFR § 1.121(c)(ii)

1. A method comprising:
receiving color images from source clients via a computer network;
communicating the color images to destination clients via the computer network; and
modifying the color images based on the colorimetric responses of display devices
associated with the source clients.
2. The method of claim 1, further comprising modifying the color images based on
the colorimetric responses of display devices associated with the destination clients.
3. The method of claim 1, further comprising modifying the color images at a
network server, wherein the network server includes a web server, and the images are accessible
via a web site served by the web server.
4. The method of claim 1, further comprising modifying the color images at a
network server before communication of the color images to the destination clients.
5. The method of claim 1, wherein the source clients include auction sellers, the
images represent auction items, and the destination clients include auction buyers.
6. The method of claim 1, wherein the source clients include photographers, and the
images represent photographs taken by the photographers.
7. The method of claim 1, further comprising characterizing the colorimetric
responses of the display devices by delivering a series of web pages to the client that guide the
clients through a color profiling process.
8. The method of claim 7, further comprising:

guiding the clients through the color profiling process by delivering a series of web pages to the clients;

generating web cookies for the clients containing information representing the results of the color profiling process; and

transmitting the web cookies to a network server for use in the modification of the color images.

9. The method of claim 8, wherein the network server modifies the color images based on the contents of the web cookie.

10. The method of claim 1, wherein the network server resides on the World Wide Web, and the color images form parts of web pages received by the clients from the network server.

11. The method of claim 1, further comprising calculating a fee for each modified image.

12. The method of claim 11, further comprising:
permitting the source clients to specify whether the color images are to be modified;
charging the fee to the source clients in the event modification of the color images is specified.

13. The method of claim 11, further comprising:
permitting the destination clients to specify whether the color images are to be modified;
charging the fee only in the event modification of the color images is specified.

14. The method of claim 1, wherein the source clients are auction sellers, the images represent auction items, and the destination clients are auction buyers, the method further comprising calculating a fee for each modified image, and charging the fee to one or both of the source and destination clients involved in an auction sale.

15. The method of claim 1, wherein the source clients include auction sellers, the images represent auction items, and the destination clients include auction buyers, the method further comprising calculating, for each modified image, a fee based on a percentage of the sales amount paid between source and destination clients involved in an auction sale, and charging the fee to one or both of the source and destination clients involved in the auction sale.

16. A computer readable medium containing program code that causes a programmable processor to:

- receive color images from source clients via a computer network;
- communicate the color images to destination clients via the computer network; and
- modify the color images based on the colorimetric responses of display devices associated with the source clients.

17. The computer-readable medium of claim 16, wherein the code causes the processor to modify the color images based on the colorimetric responses of display devices associated with the destination clients.

18. (Amended) The computer readable medium of claim 16, ~~further comprising a network server,~~ wherein the images are accessible via a web site served by ~~the a~~ network server.

19. The computer readable medium of claim 16, wherein the code causes the processor to modify the color images at a network server before communication of the color images to the destination clients.

20. The computer readable medium of claim 16, wherein the source clients are auction sellers, the images represent auction items, and the destination clients are auction buyers.

21. The computer readable medium of claim 16, wherein the source clients are photographers, and the images represent photographs taken by the photographers.

22. The computer readable medium of claim 16, wherein the code causes the processor to characterize the colorimetric responses of the display devices by guiding the clients through a color profiling process.

23. The computer readable medium of claim 22, wherein the code causes the processor to guide the client through the color profiling process by delivering a series of web pages to the client.

24. The computer readable medium of claim 22, wherein the color profiling process includes estimating a gamma for each of the display devices.

25. The computer readable medium of claim 22, wherein the code causes the processor to:
 guide the clients through the color profiling process by delivering a series of web pages to the clients;
 generate web cookies for the clients containing information representing the results of the color profiling process; and
 transmit the web cookies to a network server for use in the modification of the color images.

26. The computer readable medium of claim 22, wherein the code causes the processor to control a network server that modifies the color images based on the contents of the web cookie.

27. The computer readable medium of claim 26, wherein the network server includes a color server that modifies the color images based on the contents of the web cookies.

28. The computer readable medium of claim 27, wherein the network server resides on the World Wide Web, and the color images form parts of web pages received by the clients from the network server.

29. The computer readable medium of claim 22, wherein the code causes the processor to calculate a fee for each modified image.

30. The computer readable medium of claim 29, wherein the code causes the processor to:

- permit the source clients to specify whether the color images are to be modified;
- charge the fee to the source clients in the event modification of the color images is specified.

31. The computer readable medium of claim 22, wherein the source clients are auction sellers, the images represent auction items, and the destination clients are auction buyers, and the code causes the processor to calculate a fee for each modified image, and charge the fee to one or both of the source and destination clients involved in an auction sale.

32. The computer readable medium of claim 31, wherein the code causes the processor to:

- permit the source clients to specify whether the color images are to be modified;
- charging the fee only in the event modification of the color images is specified.

33. The computer readable medium of claim 31, wherein the code causes the processor to:

- permit the destination clients to specify whether the color images are to be modified;
- charging the fee only in the event modification of the color images is specified.

34. The computer readable medium of claim 22, wherein the source clients are auction sellers, the images represent auction items, and the destination clients are auction buyers,

and the code causes the processor to calculate, for each modified image, a fee based on a percentage of the sales amount paid between source and destination clients involved in an auction sale, and charge the fee to one or both of the source and destination clients involved in the auction sale.

35. The computer readable medium of claim 22, wherein the program code is contained both in physical data storage media and signals transmitted between the client and other resources on the computer network.

36. A system comprising:
a network server that receives color images from source clients and communicates the color images to destination clients; and
a color image server that modifies the color images based on the colorimetric responses of display devices associated with the source clients.

37. The system of claim 36, wherein the color image server modifies the color images based on the colorimetric responses of display devices associated with the destination clients.

38. (Amended) The system of claim 36, wherein the network server includes a ~~network-web~~ server, and the images are accessible via a web site served by the ~~network-web~~ server.

39. (Amended) The system of claim 36, wherein the ~~network-color image~~ server modifies the color images before communication of the color images to the destination clients.

40. The system of claim 36, wherein the source clients include auction sellers, the images represent auction items, and the destination clients include auction buyers.

41. The system of claim 36, wherein the source clients include photographers, and the images represent photographs taken by the photographers.

42. The system of claim 36, further comprising a color profile server that guides the source and destination clients through a color profiling process to obtain information characterizing the colorimetric responses of the display devices associated with the clients.

43. The system of claim 42, wherein the color profile server guides the source and destination clients through the color profiling process by delivering a series of web pages to the client.

44. The system of claim 42, wherein the color profiling server guides the clients through the color profiling process by delivering a series of web pages to the clients, and generates web cookies for the clients containing information representing the results of the color profiling process, the clients transmitting the web cookies to the network server.

45. (Amended) The system of claim 44, wherein the network-color image server modifies the color images based on the contents of the web cookie.

46. The system of claim 44, wherein the network server resides on the World Wide Web, and the color images form parts of web pages received by the clients from the network server.

47. The system of claim 36, further comprising a fee calculation module that calculates a fee for each modified image.

48. The system of claim 47, wherein the fee calculation module charges the fee to the source clients in the event modification of the color images is specified.

49. The system of claim 36, wherein the source clients are auction sellers, the images represent auction items, and the destination clients are auction buyers, the system further

comprising a fee calculation module that calculates a fee for each modified image, and charges the fee to one or both of the source and destination clients involved in an auction sale.

50. The system of claim 36, wherein the source clients are auction sellers, the images represent auction items, and the destination clients are auction buyers, the system further comprising a fee calculation module that calculates, for each modified image, a fee based on a percentage of the sales amount paid between source and destination clients involved in an auction sale, and charges the fee to one or both of the source and destination clients involved in the auction sale.

51. (New) A method comprising:
receiving color images from source clients via a computer network;
storing the color images at a network server that includes a web server, wherein the stored
images are accessible via a web site maintained by the web server;
communicating the color images to destination clients that access the web site via the
computer network;
characterizing the colorimetric responses of display devices associated with the source
clients and the destination clients by delivering a series of web pages that guide the source and
destination clients through a color profiling process; and
modifying the color images based on the colorimetric responses of the display devices
associated with the source clients and the destination clients.

52. (New) The method of claim 51, further comprising modifying the color images at
the network server before communication of the color images to the destination clients.

53. (New) The method of claim 51, wherein the source clients include auction sellers,
the images represent auction items, and the destination clients include auction buyers.

54. (New) The method of claim 51, wherein the source clients include photographers,
and the images represent photographs taken by the photographers.

55. (New) The method of claim 51, further comprising:
generating web cookies for the clients containing information representing the results of
the color profiling process; and
transmitting the web cookies to a network server for use in the modification of the color
images, wherein the network server modifies the color images based on the contents of the web
cookie.

56. (New) The method of claim 51, wherein the color images form parts of web
pages received by the destination clients from the web server.

57. (New) The method of claim 51, further comprising:
permitting the source clients to specify whether the color images are to be modified;
charging a fee to the source clients in the event modification of the color images is
specified.

58. (New) The method of claim 51, further comprising:
permitting the destination clients to specify whether the color images are to be modified;
charging a fee to the destination clients in the event modification of the color images is
specified.

59. (New) A computer readable medium containing program code that causes a
programmable processor to:
receive color images from source clients via a computer network;
store the color images at a network server that includes a web server, wherein the stored
images are accessible via a web site maintained by the web server;
communicate the color images to destination clients that access the web site via the
computer network;

characterize the colorimetric responses of display devices associated with the source clients and the destination clients by delivering a series of web pages that guide the source and destination clients through a color profiling process; and

modify the color images based on the colorimetric responses of the display devices associated with the source clients and the destination clients.

60. (New) The computer readable medium of claim 59, wherein the code causes the processor to modify the color images at a network server before communication of the color images to the destination clients.

61. (New) The computer readable medium of claim 59, wherein the source clients are auction sellers, the images represent auction items, and the destination clients are auction buyers.

62. (New) The computer readable medium of claim 59, wherein the source clients are photographers, and the images represent photographs taken by the photographers.

63. (New) The computer readable medium of claim 59, wherein the code causes the processor to:

generate web cookies for the clients containing information representing the results of the color profiling process; and

transmit the web cookies to a network server for use in the modification of the color images, wherein the code causes the processor to control the network server to modify the color images based on the contents of the web cookie.

64. (New) The computer readable medium of claim 63, wherein the network server resides on the World Wide Web, and the color images form parts of web pages received by the clients from the network server.

65. (New) The computer readable medium of claim 59, wherein the code causes the processor to:

permit the source clients to specify whether the color images are to be modified;
charge a fee to the source clients in the event modification of the color images is
specified.

66. (New) The computer readable medium of claim 59, wherein the code causes the
processor to:

permit the destination clients to specify whether the color images are to be modified;
charging a fee in the event modification of the color images is specified.

67. (New) The computer readable medium of claim 59, wherein the source clients are
auction sellers, the images represent auction items, and the destination clients are auction buyers,
and the code causes the processor to calculate, for each modified image, a fee based on a
percentage of the sales amount paid between source and destination clients involved in an
auction sale, and charge the fee to one or both of the source and destination clients involved in
the auction sale.

68. (New) A system comprising:
a network server that receives color images from source clients via a computer network,
stores the color images, and communicates the color images to destination clients via a web site
accessed by the destination clients;

a color profiling server that characterizes the colorimetric responses of display devices
associated with the source clients and the destination clients by delivering a series of web pages
that guide the source and destination clients through a color profiling process; and

a color image server that modifies the color images based on the colorimetric responses
of display devices associated with the source clients and the destination clients.

69. (New) The system of claim 68, wherein the color image server modifies the color
images before communication of the color images to the destination clients.

70. (New) The system of claim 68, wherein the source clients include auction sellers, the images represent auction items, and the destination clients include auction buyers.

71. (New) The system of claim 68, wherein the source clients include photographers, and the images represent photographs taken by the photographers.

72. (New) The system of claim 68, wherein the color profiling server generates web cookies for the clients containing information representing the results of the color profiling process, the clients transmits the web cookies to the network server, and the color image server modifies the color images based on the contents of the web cookie.

73. (New) The system of claim 68, wherein the network server resides on the World Wide Web, and the color images form parts of web pages received by the clients from the network server.

74. (New) The system of claim 36, further comprising a fee calculation module that calculates and charges a fee to the source clients in the event modification of the color images is specified.